DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 030 TM 021 734

AUTHOR McCarthy, Christopher; And Others
TITLE A Multi-Faceted Analysis of a New Therapeutic Model of Linking Appraisals to Affective Experiences.
PUB DATE Apr 94
NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 4-8, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Affective Behavior; Counseling; Data Analysis; *Evaluation; *Experience; Graduate Students; Higher Education; Models; *Qualitative Research; Research Methodology; Stress Variables; *Therapy
IDENTIFIERS Multidimensional Approach

ABSTRACT

I. Roseman, M. Spindel, and P. Jose (1990) had previously demonstrated that specific appraisals of events led to discrete emotional responses, but this model has not been widely tested by other research teams using alternative research methods. The present study utilized four qualitative research methods, taught by Patti Lather at the 1994 American Educational Research Association (AERA) Professional Development Winter Institute, to examine data obtained from 35 Master's level counseling students about their emotions and cognitive appraisals during stressful events. The results of this study verified that individuals process stressful events much as Roseman et al. (1990) predicted, but that each of the four research paradigms disclosed different aspects of the data. (Contains 26 references.) (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 371 030

A Multi-Faceted Analysis of a New Therapeutic Model of Linking Appraisals to Affective Experiences

Christopher McCarthy, M.A.

Greg Brack, Ph.D.

Rebecca Beaton, B.A.

Kenneth B. Matheny, Ph.D, A.B.P.P.

Department of Counseling and Psychological Services

Georgia State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CHRISTOPHER McCARTHY
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Note: We would also like to recognize the following assistants: Bette Chambless, Kevin Eames, Rebecca Jordan, Mary Beth Mayhall, and Andera Zucker.

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 4-8, 1994 New Orleans, LA.

Correspondence regarding this paper should be addressed to:

Christopher McCarthy, MA
Department of Counseling and Psychological Services
University Plaza, School of Education
Georgia State University 30303-3083

Running Head: COGNITIVE APPRAISAL

TM021734

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Roseman, Spindel, & Jose (1990) had previously demonstrated that specific appraisals of events led to discrete emotional responses, but this model has not been widely tested by other research teams using alternative research methods. The present study utilized four qualitative research methods, taught by Patti Lather at the 1994 AERA Professional Development Winter Institude, to examine data obtained from subjects about their emotions and cognitive appraisals during stressful events. The results of this study verified that individuals process stressful events much as Roseman et al. (1990) predicted, but that each of the four research paradigms disclosed different aspects of the data.

A Multi-Faceted Analysis of a New Therapeutic Model of Linking Appraisals to Affective Experiences

"Qualitative analysis...is the search for patterns in data and for ideas that help explain the existence of those patterns...Don't look for closure in the process. If you're doing it right, it never stops." (Bernard, 1988, p.319).

Many alternatives to "traditional" quantitative research methods are gaining widespread attention from social scientistis, including those in the helping professions. In fact, the American Educational Research Association Professional Development Winter Institute (January 14-15, Clearwater, FL) was titled "Gender issues in methodology: Data analysis in the crisis of representation." The workshop which focused on qualitative techniques of interest to the emerging field of feminist researchers was taught by Patti Lather, author of Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern (19). Workshop participants were introduced to four techniques of "reading data," especially data typically characterized as "qualitiative data." Lather titled these four approaches: CLOSE READING/REALIST TALE, CRITICAL STRUCTURAL READING/ CRITICAL TALE, SITUATED READING/REFLEXIVE READING, POSTMODERN AND POSTSTRUCTURAL READING/DECONSTRUCTIVE TALE. Each of these readings will be reviewed in detail below, but the key point to using all of them on the

same data base is to provide a multi-dimensional analysis of the data.

The primary premise of this approach is that with multiple perspectives of the same data, results will emerge that would be missed if only one of the four analyses is used alone. Of course, this is analogous to the emergence of three dimensional vision from the uniquely different perspective of two eyes working in tandem (Kirk & Miller, 1986). Therefore, the purpose of the present paper is to describe the application of these four specific qualitative research methods to the data collected as a component of a study of the retrospective cognitions of individuals during times of stress.

Why Choose An Qualitative Research Approach?

Qualitiative research methodolgy has a rich and varied history, and it is becoming extremely popular with helping professionals. There are several reasons for the growing use of this paradigm. First, qualitative research methodology covers a diverse number of specific methods that are each uniquely suited to various facets of the helping enviornment. In this paper, four of these methodologies are examined in detail (Jacob, 1987). Second, qualitative methods allow the researcher to gather data in much the same format as it occurs in the helping professionals environment

(Aiach, Cebe & Broclain, 1990; Henwood & Pidgeon, 1992). Third, the rich and extensive historical traditions of qualitative research provides important guidelines to alternative research approaches (Jacob). Fourth, the very nature of defining and analyzing the reliability and validity of qualitative data brings into question theoretical assumptions of the study and data colllection. Such questions are particularly appropriate and welcomed by applied social scientists (Kirk & Miller). Fifth, qualitative methods allow researchers to explore both the "emic" (subjective) and "etic" (objective) perspectives of the data (Bernard, 1988). Sixth, many of the theories popular to applied social scientists (i.e., systems theory, process modeling, etc.) seem particularly well suited to investigations by qualitative researchers (Moon, Dillon, & Sprenkle, 1990). Finally, many of these qualitative approaches open up often intense and explosive debate among researchers about the political and ideological issues involved in applied social science research (i.e., see Lather, 1986, 1991, & 1992). Thus, while an almost endless list of benefits (and disadvantages) of qualitative approaches can be provided, qualitative research orientations can offer an exciting perspective to data analysis.

Why Use These Four Methods (or Tales)?

Only the four specific types of approaches listed above (and taught at Lather's workshop) are used in the present study for several reasons. First, the entire issue of the theoretical underpinnings of Lather's feminist focus has attracted much attention (i.e., see Peplau and Conrad, 1989) and serves as an excellent backdrop to test the assumptions of applied cognitive psychology, especially the use of such models as Roseman's appraisal/emotion linkages reviewed below (Roseman et al., 1990). Second, since AERA has sponsored training workshops on these specific methods, it was felt that the annual convention was an appropriate place to report the results of using these approaches. Third, Lather believes that these four perspectives, while neither exhaustive nor mutually exclusive, provide a critical movement of analysis from the traditional to the more esoteric and fragmented postmodern viewpoints. Fourth, these four approaches are structured to assess the "truth claims" inherent in each paradigm, and thus to delineate both each method's strengths and weaknesses. Fifth, the AERA Annual Meeting Program Committee has emphasized the importance of incorporating alternative formats, contexts, and approaches into educational research. Therefore, the testing of these models for presentation at the annual

convention which was developing many new means of representing research seemed particularly appropriate. Finally, the "goal is to proliferate, juxtapose, create disjunction among different different ways of reading: to work toward a multilayered data anlysis that is emotionally complex, loose with improvisational spirit, and radical in its rebuke of genre expectations" (Lather, 1994 p.3). Thus, Lather's methodology involves a striking mult-faceted approach to qualitative data.

Why Use a Cognitive Thereoretical Model To Test?

It is no surprise to helping professionals that cognitive-behavioral models based on cognitive psychology have received widespread attention and application within the clinical domain and clinical resarch literature. Cognitive-behavioral theorists have suggested that negative affect is linked to how emotional events are cognitively processed (Ellis, 1967, Beck, 1976). However, although theories of emotion have been postulated in the science of psychology at least since William James (1884), the precise process whereby negative emotions develop has not been fully defined (Roseman, 1982). Unfortunately, among all this clinical and research attention, relatively less scholarly effort has been extended to formal qualitative investigations of the cognition/affect relationships which is

surprising since such research questions would seemingly be highly appropriate for qualitative studies. As will be discussed below, open-ended qualitative type data is routinely gathered as a component of the more traditional quantitative studies of Roseman and associates' model (McCarthy, Brack, Matheny, & Beaton, 1993; McCarthy, Brack, & Matheny, 1993; McCarthy & Brack, 1993). Applying Lather's approach to data commonly gathered but not formally assessed involves permits important additional insights into Roseman's model and provides an exploratory approach to cognitive models of affect.

Roseman's Model of Appraisal/Emotion Linkages

Roseman, Spindel, & Jose (1990) developed a model that illustrates specific appraisals of events are linked to specific emotional responses. They suggested that their model might be universal across all human interactions, but it has not been fully tested in applied settings. What is unique about Roseman et al.'s model is that it identifies the specific appraisal patterns that lead to discrete emotional states. They believe that appraisals are made based on the following dimensions:

Situational state - whether a specific event is consistent or inconsistent with what is desired by the individual.

Motivational state - whether the individual is seeking something pleasurable or striving to avoid something painful.

Probability - whether the occurrence of an event is appraised as certain or uncertain.

Power - how much the individual feels he/she is capable of coping with the situation.

Agency-Self - High ratings indicate the individual appraised the situation as caused by him/her.

Agency-Other - High ratings indicate the individual appraised the situation as caused by another person.

Agency-Circumstance - High ratings indicate the individual appraised the situation as caused by the circumstances of the event, and not by himself/herself or another person.

Legitimacy - whether or not the individual believes he/she deserved the occurrence of the event.

Based on the above appraisals, Roseman et al. (1990) believed they could determine how the individual would feel in a given set of circumstances. Roseman's theory includes 10 negative emotions (disgust, distress, sadness, fear, unfriendliness, anger, frustration, shame, regret, and guilt) and six positive emotions (joy, relief, affection, pride, hope, and surprise). Based on appraisals of the dimensions, Roseman et al.

(1990) believed that specific emotional states could be identified. Table 1, derived from Roseman et al. (1990), demonstrates the specific relationships of appraisals to emotional states.

Insert Table 1 about here

For example, an event inconsistent with one's motives (appraised as low in situational state), in which the individual feels weak (appraised as low in power) and caused by oneself (appraised as high on agency-self) would result in the emotional state of shame. However, changing just one appraisal dimension will result in an entirely different emotion. If an individual appraises the event as caused by another person (appraised as high on agency-other) and all of the other appraisal dimensions remain constant, the emotion of dislike will result.

The purpose of the present study was to test Roseman et al.'s (1990) model of the cognitive appraisals which elicit discrete emotional states. This study attempted to determine whether subjects given a specific set of cognitive appraisals report emotions produced by these appraisals that are consistent with those predicted by Roseman et al. Specifically, appraisal patterns hypothesized to produce "fear" and

"anger" (two of the sixteen emotions included in Roseman et al.'s model) were tested.

While Roseman et al. (1990) posit a generic model, this technology has been validated in applied settings, specifically in the realms of stress management (McCarthy & Brack, 1993) and family of origin issues (McCarthy & Brack, 1992). The authors of the present study believe these results are encouraging for cognitive-behavioral approaches to psychotherapy, as it suggests that clinicians may be able to work backwards from their client's emotional experiences to identify the specific appraisals they are making of problematic events in their lives. Each of these studies has tested appraisal patterns by asking subjects to recall certain emotional experiences and then to rate their appraisals of these events. However, as a further test of the clinical utility of this model, the present authors believe it important to test the reversibility of the model: whether subjects given a certain pattern of appraisals will identify emotions consistent with that predicted by Roseman et al.

Participants

The participants in the present study were 35 Masters level counseling students enrolled in a large, southeastern university. The mean age of the participants who responded to demographic questions was

32.6, with a range of 22 to 49. The subject pool was 88% female and 12% male; 76% Caucasian and 24% African-American; 56% single, 32% married and 12% divorced. The subjects were given extra credit in courses for participating in this study.

Instrumentation

Two written scenarios were chosen to test Roseman et al.'s model (1990). One scenario consisted of a set of appraisal patterns designed, according to Roseman et al.'s model, to elicit the emotion of "anger". The other scenario was designed to elicit the emotion of "fear". These emotions were chosen as they are common therapeutic concerns in clinical settings. The subjects were given a two-part questionnaire, one for each scenario. In each scenario, the subjects were asked to recall an event that fit a set of six criteria developed according to Roseman (1982) and Roseman et al.'s (1990) procedure for categorizing discrete differences between specific emotions.

For each scenario, subjects were then asked to specify the predominant emotion they felt as the result of the event from a list of 16 specified in Roseman et al.'s (1990) model. Subjects were also asked how long ago the event occurred. The initial descriptors used in the questionnaires were developed and validated by Brack

(1989). The beginning of each questionnaire asked subjects to recall an actual event from their lives which fit each of the appraisals hypothesized by Roseman et al. (1990) to elicit a particular emotion. Consistent with Table 1, in the "fear" scenario, subjects were asked to recall an event in which: the potential for punishment was present; they did not want to be punished; they were uncertain whether they would be punished; they felt weak in being able to control what was going to happen; they deserved the punishment; and the event was caused by circumstances, not by themselves or another person.

For the "anger" scenario, the following conditions were specified: the potential for punishment was present; they did not want to be punished; they were uncertain whether they would be punished; they felt powerful in being able to control what was going to happen; they did not deserve to be punished and the event was caused by another person, not the circumstances of the event or by themselves.

The subjects were also given a list of the 16 emotions Roseman et al. (1990) used in their model (including "fear" and "anger") and were asked to identify the predominant emotion they experienced as a result of this event occurring. Subjects were then asked to write a story about the event. Roseman et al.

used this procedure to facilitate recall of the event. Following a procedure developed by Blix and Brack (1989), the subjects were then asked to answer four additional questions pertaining to the subject's cognitive "frame" of this event. This procedure was also intended to enhance recall as well as to provide more information for qualitative analysis of the subject's appraisal patterns (Brack, LaClave, & Blix, 1987). These included asking the subjects:

1. What meaning did this event have for you?
2. How did you interpret this event?
3. What other frames might you have used instead?
4. Why did you not use these other frames?

Introduction to The Four Methods of Analyses

As discussed above, Lather has defined four ways of representing data and reading the "truth" in that data: CLOSE READING/REALIST TALE, CRITICAL STRUCTURAL READING/ CRITICAL TALE, SITUATED READING/REFLEXIVE READING, POSTMODERN AND POSTSTRUCTURAL READING/DECONSTRUCTIVE TALE. Each form is given both a reading name and a tale name in order to remind users that each approach is only one of many means of analysis, and that each analysis tells its own imperfect story. In the first method addressed in the present study, the CLOSE

READING/REALIST TALE, the researcher takes a rational and detached descriptive and observational approach which reflects the general tenets of realism, positivism, and empiricism as generally taught in traditional research methods courses. This approach seeks to "Construct authoritarian 'this is the way to say it,' what Haraway calls a 'god's eye point of view,' the position from nowhere/everywhere" (Lather, 1994, p. 3). This perspective seeks to delineate the research subject's point of view without the ideology or personhood of the researcher interfering in the interpretation. Thus, in the CLOSE READING/REALIST TALE the researcher attempts to fulfill the stereotypical "scientist" role.

In the second analyses, the CRITICAL STRUCTURAL READING/CRITICAL TALE, the researcher switches from detached and objective observer into an "interventionist ...advocate/emancipator of self and/or others" (Lather, 1994, p. 3). Typically, Lather has espoused a feminist and post-Marxist background in her writings, but in the present paper the authors have taken cognitive psychology as the discourse to advocate. As discussed above, applied aspects of cognitive psychology have had a significant impact, and widespread appreciation, among helping professionals, and the purpose of its use in this analysis is to make overt the underlying advocacy

of the model often covertly latent in other research programs. In essence, the trends, meanings, and specifics of the Roseman model found in the data are exposed. By embracing and honestly pursuing the models legitimacy within the data, the reader is also confronted with the blatent advocacy of the analysis, and thus not covertly manipulated by the researcher into accepting the research as either objective or non-ideological.

The third method of analysis, the SITUATED READING/REFLEXIVE READING, is where the role of researcher is abandoned and the uniquely personal experience of the research for the research team is explored. The research team attempts to find our own voice and experience so that the reader of the project understands our psychosocial anchors to the data and the role of the project upon our lives. The objective and removed role of scientist is now totally abandoned and replaced by the "gut level" human interface with the data.

Finally, in the POSTMODERN AND POSTSTRUCTURAL READING/DECONSTRUCTIVE TALE, the goal is "to grasp both specificity and discontinuity...to present knowledge in fragmented way...to leave the reader to interpret the events, to use data as vivification instead of 'proof'"

(Lather, p. 3). This critiique of the entire theoretical and empirical nature of the project dissects what was missing, manipulated, hidden, subverted, inscribed, and simplified. The goals is to fragment the study until readers are forced to confront the very essence of the construct "research" and its application to the data. Through such fragmentation, "truths" buried under a variety of historical, empirical, and political formats are "freed" and able to compete for inclusion in the readers consciousness.

In summary, the multiple analyses perspectives taught and encouraged by Lather open up both disturbing and exciting trends which confirm and disconfirm traditional research models and the process of "doing research." Below we examine each as applied to our data.

CLOSE READING/REALIST TALE: Procedures and Results

In this section, our approach to the data is the "traditional" concerns of reliable and valid trends discerned from the subjects' open-ended answers. The issue of establishing the reliability and validity of results for qualitative analyses is beyond the scope of the present paper but interested readers are referred to Atkinson, Heath, and Chenail (1991), Jacob (1987), Kirk and Miller (1986), and Lather (1986, 1991) for thorough discussions of this topic.

In the present study, a two step analysis of the data was conducted. In the first step a purely descriptive analysis of the modal responses of the various described emotions for each of the scenarios was conducted. The modal responses of reported emotions, followed by the percentage of subjects endorsing the emotions for the "fear" scenario, were: fear (endorsed by 26%), distress (19%), frustration (13%), and guilt (13%). In the "anger" scenario, "fear" was again the dominant emotion (endorsed by 29%), with distress and frustration reported by 13% of subjects. These results seem to indicate that self-reported incidents of emotion did not follow the constructed scenarios according to Roseman et al. (1990).

The next step of the analysis was to examine individual responses to determine general themes, or patterns of responding in the scenarios. In doing this, a qualitative review, using procedures developed and validated by Brack et al. (1988; 1989) was conducted to determine the most significant themes in the subjects' responses. Consistent with this methodology, two coders were used to examine salient themes. Hereafter, these coders will be referred to as coders A and B. Coder A was generally unfamiliar with the Roseman model and the research techniques used to generate the data. In

following the procedures for discerning themes for qualitative data described by Brack et al., the coder was instructed to inspect the written responses of the subjects and to discern whatever trends and results that could be summarized from the data. The coder met with the research team several times to discuss and clarify the emerging themes apparent to the coder. It is important to note that the coder was assured that there were no "right answers" or hidden agendas and that whatever results were identified were important to the project. After several of these meetings, the coder provided the researchers with a written list of the identified themes and the subjects who demonstrated responses representative of these themes. Next, a second coder was obtained and was taught the coding system constructed by coder A. (Note: Coder A instructed coder B.) Coder B then independently rated all of the subject's responses noting first whether the identified themes were present in the data at all, and then specifically whether these themes were present in the subjects attributed by coder A. Finally, coder B also identified subjects displaying the themes, but missed or misattributed by Coder A. Over all the subjects, there was over 90% agreement among the coders on theme attribution, and the coder B assured the researchers that the identified themes were present in the data.

Coder A identified one predominant theme as salient for all subject responses: whether the subjects perceived themselves as acting from a position of low power or high power. Whether or not subjects endorsed the emotion the scenario was designed to elicit, several permutations of the low/high power theme were represented:

1. Subjects reported acting out of a frame of low power but also described an awareness of the possibility of framing the event in a different way.
2. Subjects reported an awareness of the possibility of viewing themselves as powerful during the event, but perceived punishment in the event caused the subjects to act as if they had low power.
3. Subjects reported acting out of a frame of low power but did not evidence any an awareness of that the event could have been framed as high power.
4. Subjects reported acting out of a frame of low power, but the coder (coder B) believed that the subject was really describing a situation of high power.
5. Subjects reported acting out of a frame of low power, and, as the event progressed, began acting out of a frame of high power. This occurred because of fear of punishment or because of the circumstances of the event. One subject who originally acted out of a frame of how

power was forced into a frame of low power due to the circumstances of the event, but then described themselves as acting out of a frame of high power. Clearly, though while all of the identified themes do not match cleaning with the Roseman model, the aspects of the power dimension seem highly salient in the subjects responses. Still, the two coders did not determine that all aspects of Roseman's appraisals were clearly apparent in the subject's written responses.

To evaluate the accuracy of the subjects' recalled appraisals, two additional coders were used to check whether or not subjects were describing events consistent with the appraisal pattern specified in each scenario. Six of the 35 subjects' questionnaires were used to train the coders. The remaining 29 sets of questionnaires were evaluated. For each set of two questionnaires, each coder was asked to read the subjects' description of the recalled event and indicate, for each of the appraisal dimensions, whether the subject's response fit the indicated appraisal (for example, gave a story in which they were high in "power" as asked), contradicted the indicated appraisal (for example, gave a story in which it was clear they were low in "power" when they were asked to provide a story in which they were high in "power"), or whether the subjects' appraisal on that given dimension could not be

discerned from the story. The overall coefficient of agreement for the two coders was 73%. While this may judged to be lower than the reliability expected of a standardized psychological instrument, the authors of this study considered this acceptable, as this is much higher than could be expected by chance (given that each coder had 3 options from which to choose). The reliabilities for each of the appraisal dimensions varied considerably: situational state 94%; motivational state 89%; power 62%; legitimacy 57%; agency 64%; probability 64%.

Based on ratings of subject responses, only 18% of the scenarios were rated as being consistent for each of the six appraisal dimensions specified. The percentage of appraisal dimensions which were "correct" is as follows: situational state 98%; motivational state 92%; power 57%; legitimacy 65%; agency 80%; probability 76%. Thus, on situational and motivational state, the subjects responses were overwhelmingly in agreement with the model. Additionally, agency and probability appraisals were largely in the predicted direction.

In summary, it is a clear that a purely descriptive approach to analyzing the relationship of appraisal patterns to reported emotions underestimates the accuracy of Roseman et al.'s (1990) model. In the

examination of the qualitative aspects of the data, it is clear that the model is supported, but that subjects may move beyond predicted emotions to other feeling states over time. It is believed that the dynamic interplay between appraisals, emotions, and other factors such as time, which have significant clinical implications for helping professions, is not fully apparent from this type of data analysis which will be illustrated below.

CRITICAL STRUCTURAL READING/CRITICAL TALE: Procedures and Results

A second set of coders were utilized in this phase of the study (labelled Coders C and D). Unlike Coder A, Coder C was extensively familiar with the Roseman model and had participated in several more traditional quantitative studies of Roseman's data. (Note: It is also important to recognize that Coder C was an author on the present paper.) Since the goal of this approach was to serve as Roeman's advocate in analyzing the data, Coder C represented by far the most appropriate initial coder for this phase. After coder C had rated the data and identified the relevant themes, a second coder was obtained and trained by coder C in this coding method. Coder D then independently rated the data using coder C's sytem. The two coders agreed on theme identification and subject placement over 90% of the

time. At this point, it is crucial to point out that two different coding systems were identified and reliably rated by trained coders, yet as will be shown below, there are significant differences among the coding systems.

The salient themes for coder C were:

1. When specific anger scenario responses were examined, it became clear why the subjects did not always report anger as the dominant emotion in scenarios specifically set up to produce this emotion. In many cases, the subject reported the experience of anger during a description of the event but reported resolution of the event leading to a different dominant emotion at the end of the event. For instance, one subject identified their dominant emotion as fear for an event, but it was clear from the qualitative analysis that the subject did experience anger at some point during the event. The feeling of fear seemed most directly associated with the subject's predominant emotion after resolution of the event. This pattern was consistently identified throughout many of the anger scenarios. This suggests that anger may not be perceived by subjects as an acceptable emotion with which to end an event, but that it is present during the event as Roseman et al. (1990) predicted.

2. A second theme identified was that in the "fear" scenarios, there was a close relationship between fear and distress. The distinction between the two, according to Roseman et al. (1990), is the appraisal of "certainty/uncertainty". This distinction was not supported in the analysis of subject responses in this study. However, the scenario as presented to subjects may not have sufficiently emphasized this appraisal dimension to allow subjects to clearly make a distinction between the two emotions. For the "fear" scenario, Roseman et al.'s model was otherwise supported by subject responses.

3. The theme identified was that the duration of the event and how long ago it occurred seem to impact the way the event was cognitively processed. One example identified in the qualitative analysis is that as feelings of fear persist over time, they are re-appraised as distress.

4. In scenarios designed to elicit the emotion of fear, even though subjects used emotional terms such as "scared", "fearful", and "afraid" in their descriptions of the event, they did not endorse the emotion of fear as the predominant emotional experience of the event.

5. In scenarios designed to elicit the emotion of anger, several subjects seemed to turn anger into "pride" as a result of actions that they took. Through

the process of reappraisal, the subject came to view themselves as more powerful and the event moved into the "self-caused" realm.

6. In scenarios designed to elicit the emotion of anger, several subjects seemed to have difficulty in owning "power" in the ability to control what might happen in the event described. The lesser the degree of power, the further respondents seemed to move away from the emotion of anger and the closer to the emotion of fear. In these scenarios, it seemed difficult for the subjects to target another person as responsible for the event. It seemed that perceptions of power decreased as appraisals of "circumstance-agency" increased and "agency-other" decreased.

In conclusion, overwhelmingly, the coders using this analysis endorsed the validity of Roseman's model as describing and framing these trends and providing a context for the diversity and richness of the subjects' data.

SITUATED READING/REFLEXIVE TALE: Procedures and Results

Next we address the more personal and describe the reactions, relfections, and experiences of the research team to the data and the research paradigm. First, we begin with Coders A and C who had the closest contact with "organizing" the "raw data." One important

distinction that must be made in the reflexive tales for coders A and C is that coder C was thoroughly familiar with Roseman et al.'s (1990) model, whereas coder A was relatively unfamiliar with the model. Coder C reported feeling much more concerned about finding the "right" themes in the data (i.e., evidence for Roseman et al.'s 1990 model). Coder A was uncomfortable with the initial ambiguity of the task; however, after being reassured by the other members of the research team that there were no "correct" themes to be found in the data, felt "freed up" to pursue the task. Both coders reported uneasiness about the ambiguity of this type of research, as it conflicted with their empirical training in graduate school. Specific reflexive tales for each of coders is detailed below:

Coder A: Coder A experienced initial uncertainty about what was expected in analyzing the data. However, as mentioned above, this coder was encouraged by the research team to "simply read the data and look for whatever themes seemed appropriate." Interestingly, while coder A felt empowered to examine the data and find her own themes, she was struck by the passivity of many of the subjects in this study. They seemed to readily adopt the role of victim in many situations and seemed to have trouble recognizing the power they held in various situations. Unlike coder C, coder A was

struck by the diversity of subject responses - i.e., the divergent ways in which subjects responded to each of the scenarios.

Coder C: Coder C was concerned with the acceptability of the qualitative analysis. She felt inhibited because of a fear that this analysis would not be acceptable to other researchers. There was also difficulty in the organization of the material. Coder C felt that both examining the material and uncovering themes of relative importance was a very subjective process. It seemed impossible to remain within the traditional role of the researcher as an impartial observer; instead, coder C felt interwoven into the process. Coder C was also unsettled to discover how closely subjects fit Roseman et al.'s (1990) model. It was almost as if individuals are hard-wired to experience specific emotions once appraisals have been made of a situation.

Other Members of the Research Team: The other members of the research team also experienced some discomfort at applying these methods to the data. Specifically, much questioning occurred about the appropriateness of the data for these analysis. The uncertainty of defining the data as "qualitative" (i.e., "What exactly is qualitative data?") and the concern about presenting such methods at a national conference also created

alternate waves of anxiety and excitement about this project. On several occassions, the research team expressed deep concern about the "usefulness" of these methods, and the dramatically different orientation of the analysis to the data as oppossed to more traditional quantitative methods. This was especially a concern with the research members who had extensive training in advanced quantitative methods. More than once, these members expressed regret about "getting involved in this project!" This mixed acceptance/rejection of the methods of the model created a growing sense of tension as the deadline for presentations drew close. Pressure for coders and writers to complete their tasks only exacerbated the concerns over using these techniques. The time and effort needed to complete this project was severely underestimated by the research team, and only with extensive concerted effort was the deadline for completion met. Yet, simultaneously, the process was both freeing and liberating in that "correctness" of the results was rapidly replaced by an acceptance of alternative, but not competitive, perspectives. In all cases, the research team felt that the project was both an important professional and personal developmental step. Members remarked that research would "never seem the same" and that many issues previously ignored or missed by previous studies were now glaringly evident.

Such insights lead to a "maturation" and "end of innocence" about "the objective empirical approach." We believe that these insights alone justified the effort and discomfort experienced during the study.

POSTMODERN AND POSTSTRUCTURAL READING/DECONSTRUCTIVE TALE: Procedures and Results

A complete description of this phase of the research would require an entire paper in and of itself alone. Easily, this phase could be described as both the most disruptive and emotionally unsettlingly research activities any member of the reasearch team had experienced. Unfortunately, due to time constraints and scheduling conflicts, the entire research team was unable to "deconstruct" the project together, and instead several meetings of various members of the team were conducted. These meetings were initially structured along Lather's deconstructive tale questions listed above. In particular, the initial discussions centered around the "weaknesses" of the study, the previously unrecognized ideological agendas, implicit assumptions, etc. Also, an attempt was made to determine what results had been missed, minimized, and/or distorted by the previous analyses and design constraints. As Lather would expect, eventually the discussion centered upon political and gender issues

related to the research team's functioning and the project's procedures.

The issue of "gender" and "power" received extensive attention during these discussions. Three of the authors are male and have extensive training in quantitative methodology (one is a Full Professor, one an Assistant Professor, and one a Doctoral Ph.D. Candidate). The remaining author and all the coders were female and Masters level students. Thus, early in the discussions, the issue of "hierarchy" of authority and power was explored, especially as the female members of the research team had less knowledge about research methodology, publication/presentation procedures, etc. These discussions, occasionally intense and direct, reviewed the ways that power was used within the team and how the "female" aspects of the members could become devalued as the stress and strain of the project mounted. In particular, the "hierachy" was recognized to become more "efficient" and "task focused" as the project neared completion. Also, differential treatment of various members of the team by the hierarchy was recognized. Certain team members were "allowed" more emotional expression than others, and various feedback loops among the members were recognized to exacerbate each person's basic interpersonal style. Clearly, though, the deconstructive phase opened up various

issues surrounding how gender and power were utilized.

Additionally, the very nature of deconstruction was examined as to whether all team members were equally deconstructed and whether less powerful members were allowed to choose not to particiapte. While all members were assured of their power to refuse to participate in the process, it was recognized that participation was an implicit and covert assumption of the project. The deconstructive approaches are by nature both fragmentary and frequently emotionally turbulent, and most members of the team eventually experienced some discomfort and soul searching during this "self-reflective" phase.

A related issue is the demarcation of authors/coders/subjects. It is difficult to discern where the research team began and the subjects ended. Since the research decisions were made by the "hierarchy", participants were clearly only passively involved in shaping such decisions. Yet, the very nature of data gathering of cognitive/emotional reactions to stressful events introduced potential discomfort in the very individuals we sought to understand. Perhaps even more importantly, the subject's voice was largely restricted to the written word gathered at one time. Further, the fact that the subjects provided retrospective self-report data raises questions about how accurate the data

is, and how conscious and honest the subjects were with the research team. Though subjects were assurred of anonymity, in all honesty no study is totally confidential and anonymous.

Even the very nature of "author" was called into question by this study. While efforts were made to allow all the authors and most of the coders feedback into the written form of the article, again time constraints, scheduling problems, and deadlines lead to a differential amount of participation in the "final product" of this paper. The written product thus reflects more of some members impressions, views, and voices, than other members. While such differnential responsibilities and effects are common and widely accepted among researchers, readers should reflect upon the nature of writing style, editorial decisions, and choice of phrases as important delimiters to the readers awareness of "what actually occurred."

A further trend discerned during deconstruction was the "press" of the team to validate the Roseman model. While previous studies had attempted to remain "objective and impartial," the research team had built up a large number of studies that had repeatedly explored and replicated the general trends predicted by Roseman. Clearly, the research team had become "ego invested" in the model. Coder C reported that her familiarity with

Roseman et al.'s (1990) model predisposed her to select subject's words and phrases that fit the model. This might have caused her to miss information that did not fit the hypothesized appraisal-emotion relationship.

Coder A was not as familiar with Roseman et al.'s (1990) model and, therefore, did not experience the same bias towards confirming the accuracy of the model. A dominant set for this coder, however, was that of the influence of external pressure on the individual - i.e. the pressure to "fit in" and to see oneself as having less power. Thus, this coder saw many of the scenarios in terms of whether or not individuals saw themselves as having power.

Additionally, the very nature of reversing Roseman et al.'s (1990) model (i.e., giving subjects a certain pattern of appraisals and then asking them to derive a label for their emotion) appeared to be a difficult task for many subjects. For instance, subjects displayed reluctance in choosing just one emotion, and some seemed to have difficulty in interpreting the appraisal scenarios. It seemed that interpreting what was asked by each questionnaire was a highly individual process. The entire data collection procedure asked the subjects to conform more to the model, than the model had to conform to the subjects. In summary, the deconstruction

phase brought many aspects of the study into awareness and served as a potent impetus for members of the team to confront each other, their research assumptions, and the very nature of data gathering.

Overall Discussion

The Roseman model has the potential to facilitate important advancements in the theoretical and clinical applications of the helping professions. The ability to clearly, concisely, and empirically sketch the interrelationships of various emotions (and especially "negative" affect) and specific appraisals has been an elusive dream of applied cognitive psychology for decades. The authors have used the basic tenets of this theory in clinical applications (McCarthy, Brack, Matheny, & Beaton, 1993). For example, clients reporting emotions such as shame and guilt are likely to be appraising these events as unwanted but caused by themselves. Additionally, they are viewing themselves as less deserving of a positive outcome. According to Roseman et al. (1990), in helping a client move away from an emotion such as this, a clinician might work with them on appraising events differently. They might explore ways in the circumstances are responsible for the event (which in Roseman et al.'s model leads to frustration) or another individual is responsible (which in Roseman et al.'s model leads to anger]. To move from

negative emotions to positive emotions, the client may need to view themselves as more deserving of a positive outcome. The authors of this paper are not suggesting that therapists persuade their clients to distort reality, but rather be open to possible alternatives to the way in which they have framed the event. McCarthy et al. (1993) found that clients can successfully work backwards from emotions to appraisal sets.

The clinical significance of the study is that if Roseman's model is shown to be valid, then therapists working with clients who are struggling with issues in which one of the negative emotions in this study is a significant factor, now have a clue as to the cognitive appraisals that the clients are making. The appraisal patterns which produce these emotions also suggest specific ways in which client's thinking may be changed to produce affective change. If, as Lather has contended, research can have significant emancipatory effects for the disadvantaged members of society, then surely the millions of individuals suffering from depression, anxiety, shame, etc., may be offered significant assistance.

In general, the authors believe that this study tentatively supports theorists, such as Ellis (1967) and Beck (1976), who believed that individuals react to the

world based on cognitive interpretation of events. Both theorists have developed psychotherapeutic techniques that follow the assumption that one's mode of thinking influences the way one feels about an event. One of the guiding principles behind their intervention strategies is that by helping individuals change their cognitions about an event, the way they react emotionally is also affected. Roseman et al.'s (1990) theory, supported by this study, indicates which appraisals lead to which emotions. The authors hope that, in the future, cognitive therapists will not only tell their clients that their thinking can be changed, but also can tell them specific ways they may alter their thinking to handle unpleasant feelings.

Yet, each form of reading the data augmented our understanding of the model and our participation with it. While Roseman's model did not receive widespread support from the REALIST TALE, the CRITICAL TALE was quite supportive, which was, of course, its purpose. Even more enlightening, though, is the results of discerning related but distinct coding schemes that can both be reliably rated and empirically supported. The beauty of Lather's approach is that neither result must be exclusively correct, but instead are important co-contributors to full understanding of the model. Perhaps it was the PROCESS of the study, more than its

products, that are most useful for further research on this topic. The authors strongly recommend other research teams incorporate these views into their work, but such workers need to be warned that the process is both exciting and disruptive but never boring! The authors of this study feel further research is warranted in this area to more fully assess the importance of this theory for the field of counseling.

References

Aiach, P., Cebe, D., & Broclain, D. (1990). What cancer tells us about general practice. Birth of an hypothesis. Social Science Medicine, 30, 1241-1246.

Atkinson, B., Heath, A., & Chenail, R. (1991). Qualitative research and the legitimization of knowledge. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 17, 175-180.

Beck, A.T. (1976). Cognitive therapy and emotional disorders. New York: International Universities Press.

Bernard, H.R. (1988). Research methods in cultural anthropology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Blix, S. & Brack, G. (1989). The effect on pediatric nurses of a suspected case of Munchausen's Syndrome by Proxy. General Hospital Psychiatry, 10, 402-409.

Brack, G. (1989). Effectiveness of a therapeutic reframing package upon an individual's self-concept, perception of stressor and anxiety level during times of stress. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.

Brack, G., LaClave, L.J., & Heumann, K. (1989). Consultation of the medical frontier: A preliminary survey of the attitudes on infant intensive care

nurses. General Hospital Psychiatry, 11, 174-181.

Brack, G., LaClave, L., & Blix, S. (1988). The psychological aspects of bone marrow transplant: A staff's perspective. Cancer Nursing, 11.

Brack, G., LaClave, L., & Blix, S. (1987). A survey of the attitudes of burn unit nurses. Journal of Burn Care and Rehabilitation, 8, 299-306.

Ellis, A. (1967). Rational-emotive psychotherapy. In D. Arbuckle (Ed.), Counseling and psychotherapy. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jacob, E. (1987). Qualitative research traditions: A review. Review of Educational Research, 57, 1-50.

James, W. (1884). What is an emotion? Mind, 9, 188-205.

Henwood, K.L., & Pidgeon, N.F. (1992). Qualitative research and psychological theorizing. British Journal of Psychology, 83, 97-111.

Kirk, J., & Miller, M.L. (1986). Reliability and validity in qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in opening ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. Interchange, 17, 63-84.

Lather, (1991). Getting smart. New York: Routledge.

Lather, P. (1992). Critical frames in educational

research: Feminist and post-structural perspectives. Theory into Practice, 31, 87-99.

Lather, (1994). Gender issues in methodology: Data analysis in the crisis of representation. American Educational Research Association Professional Development Winter Institute, January 14-15, 1994, Clearwater, FL.

McCarthy, C. & Brack, G. (1992, August). Cognitive appraisals of emotional events within the family of origin. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

McCarthy, C. & Brack, G. (1993, April). The impact of cognitive appraisals on emotions produced by stressful events. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

McCarthy, C., Brack, G., & Matheny, K. (1993, November). The relationship of cognitive appraisals to stress coping resources in stressful events. Paper presented at the Division 17 Southeast Regional Conference, Gainesville, FL.

McCarthy, C., Brack, G., Matheny, K., & Beaton, R. (1993). A new therapeutic model for integrating affect and cognition. Paper presented at the Division 17 Southeast Regional Conference,

Gainesville, FL.

Moon, S.M., Dillon, D.R., & Spenkle, D.K. (1990). On balance and synergy: Family therapy and qualitative research revisited. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 17, 187-192.

Peplau, L.A., & Conrad, E. (1989). Beyond nonsexist research: The perils of feminist methods in psychology. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 13, 379-400.

Roseman, I. (1982). Cognitive determinants of emotions. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Yale University.

Roseman, I., Spindel, M., & Jose, P. (1990). Appraisals of emotion-eliciting events: testing a theory of discrete emotions. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 899-915.

Table 1: A simplified version of the Roseman model

	Positive emotions		Negative emotions		
	Achieved		Did not achieve		
	Rewards	Avoided Punishment	Rewards	Avoided Punishment	
Circumstances Caused					
Unknown		SURPRIZE			
Uncertain	HOPE		FEAR		Weak
Certain	JOY	RELIEF	SADNESS	DISTRESS	Weak
Uncertain	HOPE		FRUSTRATION		Strong
Certain	JOY	RELIEF	FRUSTRATION		Strong
Other Caused					
Uncertain	LIKING		DISLIKE		Weak
Certain	LIKING		DISLIKE		Weak
Uncertain	LIKING		ANGER		Strong
Certain	LIKING		ANGER		Strong
Self Caused					
Uncertain	PRIDE		SHAME/GUILT		Weak
Certain	PRIDE		SHAME/GUILT		Weak
Uncertain	PRIDE		REGRET		Strong
Certain	PRIDE		REGRET		Strong